G. R. S. IX-5]

*Previous references.* 1888

~~191~~ .

( L . R . )

*Later references.*

File No. 2.

Serial Nos. 1–6.

# GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(18)

*Serial Nos.* 1 to 6.

M. ~~Part~~ B for August 1889.

SUBJECT.

Rights of the Shrotriyadar of Vadinahalli in regard to the trees in the village.

Indexed

MM.

W D 88—GPB—50,000—24-7-16

"Shraya to one dea[illegible] money [illegible]
of Hiriyur in the [illegible] 1884, and th[illegible]
term expired on the [illegible] March 1888.-
2.- The "Shraya" holde[illegible] reported to ha[illegible]
several trees, about [illegible] to load in the
village and applied [illegible] free license to
them to Chitaldoo[illegible]
3.- Nothing is said [illegible] proceedings und[illegible]
reference about the [illegible] in the villages gran[illegible]
thereunder, nor about the levying of seignio[illegible]
rage on them.-
4.- I, therefore request to be favored with

Perhaps an upset price may be recovered
or seignior age levied.-

I have the honor to be

Sir,

Your most obedient servant

[illegible]

Deputy Commissioner

Chitaldoog District

OFFICE OF THE
8278
576.
DEWAN OF MYSORE

l Serial No. 29.)

1889

From The Deputy Commissioner
Chitaldroog District

The Chief Secretary to the Dewan
Section L & R of Mysore.
File No 2 88
Serial No 1
Dated 4th February 1889
Despatched
Received

Enclosures No. nil.

Revenual No. 517-
No. 480-

Under instruction
relating to the grant
out on progressive re
(12 Khraya tenure) to
Bédarak Villages for
Cultivation, Conveyed
in Proceedings No.
4563-72 dated 10th
8/12
November 1889, a Villag
called Vadinhally
in the Hiriyur Taluk
was applied for and
ven out on four yea

pay 7
7/2
a
to fix
Cowr the

1. was land of free
2. Why fixed? for fire
wood or timber?
3. Was setting necessary
for purpose of cultiv
or for improvement
of the village. Ry
14/2

(General Serial No. 30.)

1889.

From

The Deputy Commis.
Chutaldang Dn

Dated 21 February.

Despatched

Received

Enclosures No.

General No. 7372

No. 200

Mr docket-no 547/480 of the
February 1889, reporting
that a village called Vadm
Khally in the Shriguru Jalu
was granted on 4 years Shay
which expired on the 31 March
last; that the holder has
felled several cart-loads
of trees, and has applied
for a license to remove
them to Chutaldang.

With reference to the
above, request to be in-
formed (1) what kind of
trees were felled; (2) whether
they were felled for

Section L R
File No 2 - 88
Serial No 2

firewood or timber; and (3)
whether felling was necessa
for purposes of cultivation
or other improvement of the
village.

Yours

[illegible]

Under Secretary

(General Serial No. 29.)

1888-89 9198

10 MAR 89

From The Deputy Commissioner Chitaldroog District

To The Chief Secretary to the Dewan of Mysore.

Section R

File No 2-88

Serial No 3

Dated 11th March 1889.

Despatched

Received

Enclosures No.

General No. 563.

No. 525.

His docket No: 737/200

Dated 21st Ultimo.

— " —

With reference to the abo
has the honor to state
that Venkata Row, the
"Thrayadar" of Vadiraha
in the Hiriyur Taluk ha
felled 3 Cart load of Ba
4 Cart load of Neela,
and 3 Cart load of Mang
Trees - The first and secon
do
are fit for building purpos

The So called Srayadar
Sh. be treated as an
occupant of Govt assessed
land, and the rules regarding
trees on occupied lands, as
applied to the Taluk at the
Settlement should regulate
his rights to the trees in question.
A ~~Dis~~ Distinction Sh. be
drawn ~~between~~ between trees on
assessed occupied lands
of the lands of the Village
& those on unassessed Govt
Lands or lands set apart
for public purposes. To
trees of the latter class (and
for that matter to lands on
which such trees stand) the
Srayadar has no right.
To trees on assessed lands
of which he must be
regarded as the occupant
he may have a right
if the Settlement gave
it to the occupant. The Dep Comr must

i, E, for pillars, beams, rafters &c:; while the thra
ex will do for blanks. 6

2. Besides the above, he has felled 2 cart loads
2 ace trees fit for firewood

3. The felling was not to facilitate Cultivation
or to improve the village, but to secure good build
ing materials, as the "Shrayadar" is getting a
house built at Chidalaroog.

Asst Collector

Offg: Deputy Commissioner
Chidalaroog District.

X. Settle the question in accordance with the above observations and submit a brief report of the Settlement, together with a ~~Copy~~ classified ~~Statement~~ showing the assessed occupied lands & other lands of the Village. The Grazing tenure of a Bedniruk Village does not elevate the grantee to the position of the holder of an alienated village - such as Khazenghatta Mann or Inti.

Print
3/4/89

2

Read:

Docket No 517/488 ytte 4th February 1889 from the Dy Conr. Chitaldroog District reporting that a village called Vadambally in the Kigwwa Taluk was granted on 4 years "Shraya" tenure, which expired on the 31st March 1885 and that the holder thereof has felled several cart loads of trees therein and has applied for a license to remove them to Chitaldroog.

Section C.R
File No 2-88
Serial No 4

Read also:

Docket from the same No 563/525 of the 11th March 1889 reporting that the trees felled ~~were felt~~ for building purposes ~~and that the felling was~~ not to facilitate cultivation nor to improve the Village.

Order

The so called Shrayadar should be treated as an occupant of Govt. assessed land, & the rules regarding

trees on occupied lands, as applied to the Taluk at the settlement, should regulate his rights to the trees in question. A distinction should be drawn between trees on assessed occupied ~~assessed~~ lands ~~and~~ of the lands of the Village, and those on un-assessed Govt. lands or lands set apart for public purposes. To trees of the latter class (and for that matter to lands on which such trees stand), the Shrayadar has no right. To trees on assessed lands of which he must be regarded as the occupant, he may have a right, if the Settlement gave it to the occupant.

2. The Deputy Coll must settle the question in accordance with the above observations

9

and submit a brief report of the settlement, together with a Classified Statement shewing the apeped occupied lands and other lands of the Village.

3. The Shraya tenure of a Bechirak Village does not elevate the grantee to the position of the holder of an alienated village, such as Kayemgutta, Inam or Jodi.

Pmd

By
In Chief Secretary

To
The Deputy Commissr
Chitaldroog Dist
" Dy Comrs of other Districts
" Supdt Rev. Survey

10

889

Re by Comr Chittaldroog
by Comrs of the Dlls
Supte Rev Survey

Dated 17-April/89

No 309-317
Cif 8

*Proceedings of the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore, (Revenue),—dated 17th April 1889.*

READ THE FOLLOWING PAPERS :—

Docket No. 517—480 of the 4th February 1889 from the Deputy Commissioner, Chitaldroog District, reporting that a village called Vadinhalli in the Hiriyur Taluk was granted on four years' "Shraya" tenure, which expired on the 31st March 1888, and that the holder thereof has felled several cart-loads of trees therein, and has applied for a license to remove them to Chitaldroog.

Docket from the same No. 563—525 of the 11th March 1889, reporting that the trees were felled for building purposes, but not to facilitate cultivation nor to improve the village.

No. 309-317—CIR. 8, DATED BANGALORE, 17TH APRIL 1889.

ORDER THEREON.—The so called shrayadar should be treated as an occupant of Government assessed land, and the rules regarding trees on occupied lands, as applied to the Taluk at the settlement, should regulate his rights to the trees in question. A distinction should be drawn between trees on assessed *occupied* lands of the village, and those on unassessed Government lands or lands set apart for public purposes. To trees of the latter class (and for that matter to lands on which such trees stand), the shrayadar has no right. To trees on assessed lands of which he must be regarded as the occupant, he may have a right, if the settlement gave it to the occupant.

2. The Deputy Commissioner must settle the question in accordance with the above observations and submit a brief report of the settlement, together with a classified statement showing the assessed occupied lands and other lands of the village.

3. The shraya tenure of a bechirakh village does not elevate the grantee to the position of the holder of an alienated village, such as Kayamgutta, Inam or Jodi.

R. VIJAYINDRA RAO,
*Chief Secretary.*

To—The Deputy Commissioner, Chitaldroog.
The Deputy Commissioners of other Districts.
The Superintendent, Revenue Survey.

1889.

# GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE.

REVENUE.

PROCEEDINGS.

*Dated 17th April* 1889.

No. 309-317.
Cir. 8.

Directing that rules regarding trees on occupied lands, as applied to the Hiriyur Taluk at the Survey Settlement, should regulate the rights of the shrayadar of Vadinhalli in regard to the trees in the village.

Mysore Govt. Central Press, Bangalore.—23-4-89.—80.

Bellary Collect
15/6/89
MK

12

Submitted
Rec'd 1/8
Asst
2/8

(General Serial No. 31.)

1889. 15 JUN 89

From The Deputy Commissioner
Chitaldrug District

To The Chief Secretary
to the Govt. of Mysore

Section C. R. 1333 of 9/8/89
File No 2 80
No 5

Dated 12th June/89.
Despatched
Received

Enclosures No. one.

General No. 99.
No. 92.

Submitting a statement showing all the lands in the Vadinahalli Village of the Hiriyur Taluk granted on Sheriff tenure as called for.

Vernier Map
accompanying the
Deputy Commissioner's
Survey Rules: R.V. 3/8/89.

Manager

No. 99. Encl: Deputy Commissioner's Office
92. 1. Chitaldrug District
12th June 1889.

To

The Chief Secretary to the
Government of Mysore

Sir,

As called for in para 2 of Proceedings No. 309-317/8 dated the 17th April last, I beg to submit herewith a statement showing all the lands, in the Vadinahalli village of the Hiriyur Taluk granted on "Shroya" tenure 4 years ago.

2.- It will be seen from it that there are 17 numbers in the village and that 14 of them are assessed and 3 are unassessed and left for grazing purposes.

3.- The "Thara," and the "Lavani Fistal Patrikes" of survey settlement

Settlement Papers make no
mention as to the disposal of
the trees on the lands viz whether
they are to be given to the occupants
or sold for Government.

4.— The trees now cut by the
Shrayadars are those that were
in the aforesaid numbers. He
has cut none of those on the
"Roofat" numbers.

5.— In ordinary cases
when there are trees on lands
applied for they are invariably
sold.

6.— But when the whole of
this "village" was granted on
"Shraya tenure" the ordinary
rule of selling the trees was
not followed and that may
be because the grant was
not under the ordinary but
under the special "Shraya"
rules.

7.— The question now is as to
whether

whether any price is to be demanded for the trees cut by the Shuyadan 8.– As no stipulation was made about them at the time of the grant upwards of 4 years ago, I hesitate to think that at this distance of time we would be justified in calling on the Shuyadan to pay for the trees.

I have the honour to be
Sir
Your most obedient Servant
W. Ogilvie
Deputy Commissioner
Chilkadenay District

2.87

18

(General Serial No. 30.)

1889.

*From*

Section LR
File No 2-88 To.
Serial No 6

The Deputy Comm^r
Chitaldroog

*Dated* 9 August

*Despatched*

*Received*

**Enclosures No.**

*General No.* 3533
*No.* 84

This letter No 99/92 dated 12 June 1889 submitting a statement (called for in this Office Proc^s No. 309-17 dated the 1 April 1889) of all lands in the Vadinahalli Village, Hiriyur Taluk, granted on Shraya tenure to one Venkata Rao

—

It is observed that Venkata Rao being the occupant, he owns the trees (all but reserved trees) on the lands in his occupation under the Survey Rules.

BO

for Ch Sec